1		
2		
3		
4		
5	LIMITED STATES D	ISTRICT COURT
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
7		
8	ALAN MCMANN and DONNA	
9	McMANN, husband and wife,	CASE NO. C14-5429 BHS
10	Plaintiffs,	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR
11	V.	SUMMARY JUDGMENT
12	AIR & LIQUID SYSTEMS CORPORATION, et al.,	
13	Defendants.	
14		
15	This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Saberhagen Holdings, Inc.'s	
16	("Saberhagen") motion for summary judgment (Dkt. 44).	
17	In their complaint, Plaintiffs Alan and Donna McMann ("McManns") allege that	
18	Mr. McMann "was exposed to asbestos from work performed by [Saberhagen tradesmen]	
19	as they worked with asbestos-containing products in close proximity and without warning	
20	to Mr. McMann" Dkt. 45, Declaration of Timothy K. Thorson, Exh. B.	
21		
22		

1 On August 14, 2014, Saberhagen filed a motion for summary judgment arguing that there was no evidence that Mr. McMann ever worked with or around Saberhagen employees. Dkt. 44. The McManns failed to respond. The moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law when the nonmoving party fails to make a sufficient showing on an essential element of a claim in the case on which the nonmoving party has the burden of proof. Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986). In this case, the McManns have failed to cite and the Court is unaware of any evidence that shows that Mr. McMann worked with or around Saberhagen employees. Therefore, the McManns have failed to make a sufficient showing on an essential element of their claim against Saberhagen, and the Court GRANTS Saberhagen's motion for summary judgment. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 17th day of September, 2014. United States District Judge

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22